

Message

From: Russo, Rebecca [Russo.Rebecca@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/9/2016 10:17:52 PM
To: Cirian, Mike [Cirian.Mike@epa.gov]
CC: Moler, Robert [Moler.Robert@epa.gov]; Vranka, Joe [vranka.joe@epa.gov]; Thomas, Deb [thomas.debrah@epa.gov]; Madigan, Andrea [Madigan.Andrea@epa.gov]; Chalfant, Mark [Chalfant.Mark@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Tester Response

Great, thanks Mike!

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 9, 2016, at 2:27 PM, Cirian, Mike <Cirian.Mike@epa.gov> wrote:

Hello Rebecca,

We (Mark, Robert, Scott and I) just had a quick phone call to introduce ourselves to Robert Moler and welcome him to the team. As part of the welcoming he has volunteered to write the Draft response to the Administrator's letter from Senator Tester's office which he plans on having drafted for my review this week and we will have that for Mark early next week so we can meet the "end of next week" deadline. Robert is also going to draft a response to the 5 suggestions we received from Chad Campbell of Senator Tester's staff for my email response back to Chad. So it looks like we have a plan to meet the senator's timeframe.

Also, not sure if anyone shared with you, but I was requested to join Senator Tester during his site visit and have suggested that Robert join the site visit as well.

Let me know if you have any further questions,
Mike

Mike Cirian, PE
Libby On-site Project Manager
US EPA
108 East 9th Street
Libby, MT 59923
(406) 293-6194 Office

From: Russo, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2016 11:26 AM
To: Moler, Robert <Moler.Robert@epa.gov>; Cirian, Mike <Cirian.Mike@epa.gov>; Vranka, Joe <vranka.joe@epa.gov>
Cc: Thomas, Deb <thomas.debrah@epa.gov>; Madigan, Andrea <Madigan.Andrea@epa.gov>; Chalfant, Mark <Chalfant.Mark@epa.gov>
Subject: Tester Response

Hi all,
Senator Tester's staff (Erik and Chad) just called looking for responses to Chad's email from 2/29/16 (repasted below). I know that we are preparing a response to both this email and the 1/29/16 letter.

The Senator will be at the site on 3/23 so they want a response before then – even if it's verbal answers and our "plan forward".

Where are we with the formal response?

Do we think we'll have it ready by the end of next week?

If not, can we at least pull together the answers and have a call with Senator Tester's staff?

Thanks,
Rebecca

Rebecca A. Russo
Region 8 Congressional and Intergovernmental Liaison
Office: 303-312-6757
Cell: 303-204-1930

From: Campbell, Chad (Tester)
Sent: Monday, February 29, 2016 9:21 AM
To: 'Russo, Rebecca'; Mike Cirian (cirian.mike@epa.gov)
Cc: DiLuccia, Janelle (Tester); Swanson, Dayna (Tester) (Dayna_Swanson@tester.senate.gov); Laslovich, Dylan (Tester) (Dylan_Laslovich@tester.senate.gov); 'Nylund, Erik (Tester)' (Erik_Nylund@tester.senate.gov)
Subject: CFAC Questions

Rebecca,

Earlier this week I was able to talk with Susan Nicosia with the City of Columbia Falls. They were very happy with Mike's presentation and the information he shared at last week's City Council meeting. They would like for him to continue to come to these meetings and keep the lines of information open. As Mike noted, there has been conflicting information in related media stories which leads to fear and confusion within the community. This upcoming week Glencore is sending up its representatives to talk to community leaders about the NPL process, as they did in November.

Ms. Nicosia asked the EPA the specific questions your staff answered; she then asked the same ones to Glencore as well. Glencore's response is attached and it has some different information from what EPA provided.

A town hall meeting may not be necessary right now, but we think the press and the community at large deserves to have some of these questions answered directly by the EPA. The idea of factsheets and maybe some more in-depth background for the press may help clear up some of the uncertainty the community is feeling.

Here's what seems would be helpful:

1. EPA fact sheets publicly available providing as much information about the process as possible. Also, specifically addressing what criteria must be met to move forward with an alternative process, and if that process is somehow faster as is being asserted by some involved. EPA indicated the substance of both the alternative and Superfund processes are essentially the same, but it is clear in conversations with local residents that this remains a major source of confusion in the larger community.
2. EPA could ideally include a timeline of activity and how the process ended up where it currently sits. The public should have an understanding of how this could have been a voluntary vs. compulsory cleanup, and where different jurisdictions had potential oversight. EPA noted to us the company had an opportunity to enter into some sort of agreement prior to the NPL listing.

3. EPA mentioned the ability to provide some detailed background to media outlets to help avoid more confusion. Mike noted confusion in some articles about the process and project oversight. The complex issue of jurisdiction over removal of infrastructure and contaminants seems to need some clarification.
4. It seems prudent to plan a community style meeting within the next couple of months to answer questions that will surely come.
5. Some of the concerns about any listing are redevelopment and returning the site to productive use. It would be helpful to the community to hear of EPA success stories on similar sites.

While we appreciate the willingness EPA has shown to provide information to local elected officials, there appears to be a problem in information flowing to the public. We feel it's best to have information coming directly from EPA to the public in the most accurate and transparent manner possible. That will avoid the possibility of losing anything in translation and hopefully place everyone on the same page.

Chad Campbell
Regional Director-Northwest Montana
U.S. Senator Jon Tester
8 Third St. East - Kalispell, MT 59901
406-257-3360 (direct line) 406-257-3974 (fax)
chad_campbell@tester.senate.gov